The Senate Votes for Postal Censorship, P. 3

Veteran GOP Congressman Blames Our Latin Troubles on FDR's Good Neighbor Policy, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 36 OCTOBER 8, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

When's The President Going to Mention Racism?

Three questions stand out in the Mississippi crisis. The first is: was it befitting the dignity of the law and the Presidency for Mr. Kennedy to spend so many hours on the telephone dickering with a Southern governor who was acting in contempt of a final court order? The second is: how close to death did these dickerings and the Governor's false assurances bring James Meredith, the Federal marshals protecting him and assorted reporters and university officials in the besieged Lyceum building?

On two occasions the mob came within a hair's breadth of smashing the thin line of marshals, once when the mob tried to ram the marshals with a fire truck and the second time when mobsters tried to smash the line with a bulldozer which, fortunately, rammed into a tree. The marshals were almost out of tear gas when the first Federal troops arrived. Had they been delayed only a little longer, had the mob reformed and rushed the marshals again in the interim, as it had several times before, then it might have overpowered the marshals and taken over the school grounds. The result would have been a massacre. This is what Mr. Kennedy risked and so narrowly avoided.

Why It Was Easy to Trick Them

The reason for taking the risk was, as Miriam Ottenberg, a reporter particularly friendly to the Department of Justice wrote in the *Washington Star* (Oct. 1) that "Both the President and the Attorney General . . . wanted to avoid sending in troops if at all possible" and were therefore "particularly keen" to accept the assurances given them by Mississippi officials that State police could handle the situation. In their eagerness to avoid using Federal troops, the President and the Attorney General let Governor Barnett trick them. As Stan Opotowsky, who wrote the best and most vivid account of the campus battle, reports in the *New York Post* (Oct. 1), "Barnett had his way. He insisted that Meredith be placed on the campus before the President went on radio and TV to address the nation." The result was that "the Federal men had to run the gauntlet of idle students, who on a day other than Sunday, might have been tied down by classes. Instead they eventually grew into a crazed and rioting mob." This occurred, as Opotowsky reported, because "the Justice Department wanted Meredith in the University before Tuesday so it could get Barnett and Lt. Gov. Johnson off the hook at the deadline for their contempt of a federal court order." This desire to fix things up privately cost two lives, and risked more.

The third and most important question is: When is Mr. Kennedy going to mention racism? All through his campaign for the Presidency, as may be seen from the sample quotations in the box on this page, Mr. Kennedy criticized Mr. Eisenhower for failing to use his high office for moral leadership in the integration struggle and promised to act quite differently himself. But in his radio-TV appeal to the Mississippi students and the nation last Sunday night, Mr. Kennedy was as antiseptically neutral and uncommitted about civil rights as was Mr. Eisenhower in the Little Rock crisis. Like his predecessor, Mr. Kennedy spoke as if the President were a mere top Federal marshal, sworn to uphold the law, but not called upon to like it or discuss it. Once again at a critical moment, the weight of the Presidency was not brought to bear in support of the Court's integration rulings. Mr. Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, in the latter's TV reply to Governor Barnett, both spoke of Meredith's battle as a "private suit" with which the Federal government had no concern until called in a few weeks ago to enforce a court order. This is a position calculated to achieve the lowest common political denominator consistent with enforcement; it puts the President and the Attorney General shoulder-to-shoulder with the Southern moderates. That is not good enough.

It is not good enough because resistance to unjust law lies too deep in American tradition, as in that of every free society. We have too long been taught that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God, as indeed it is. Peaceful change in the South can only be brought about if by moral leadership and ethical education, we strengthen those silenced and besieged elements in the white South itself which realize that it is wrong to treat the Negro as a second class citizen, cruel to mark his children from their first days in school with the brand of apartness and inferiority, a sin to make another human being a "nigger." The fight cannot be won until the South is made

(Continued on Page Four)

Still Waiting

"As a moral leader, the next President must play his role . . . in our crusade for human rights. . . . For only the President, not the Senate and not the House, and not the Supreme Court . . . only the President can create the understanding and tolerance necessary. . . ."

—JFK at Los Angeles, Sept. 9, 1960.

"Moral and persuasive leadership by the President to create the conditions in which compliance with the constitutional requirements of school desegregation takes place; this is the kind of leadership I intend to give. . . . There is more power in the Presidency than to let things drift, and then suddenly to call out the troops. . . ."

—JFK in New York, Oct. 12, 1960.

"If the President does not himself wage the struggle for equal rights—if he stands above the battle—then the battle will inevitably be lost."

—JFK in Los Angeles, Sept. 9, 1960.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The GOP's Veteran Brown of Ohio Blames It All on FDR's Good Neighbor Policy

The House, Too, Had Its Mob Scene in Passing the Cuba Resolution

Mobs are not confined to Mississippi. A warlike mob spirit governed the House of Representatives when on Sept. 25 it debated the Cuba resolution. Though a motion to recommit for a stronger resolution was defeated by 251 to 140, and the Administration's resolution passed 484 to 7, very few voiced support for the President's caution and none dared go beyond his position to advocate resumption of relations with Cuba. On this page we provide excerpts to give readers the flavor of this unthinking clamor, and nostalgic longing for the days of tougher policies:

MR. BROWN (R. Ohio): Mr. Speaker, our troubles first started back in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration insofar as Latin America is concerned, when he entered into what was called the Good Neighbor policy. . . . That pólicy continued until, under Mr. Truman, we entered into the Organization of American States, and agreed . . . that we would not decide for ourselves what we should do to protect American properties and American lives in any Latin American country. . . .

For a good many years down in Latin America, on 40 different occasions, American armed forces . . . moved into countries south of the border. . . . But lately we have adopted this namby-pamby policy of attempting to turn to Latin American countries, to ask their permission. . . .

MR. CRAMER (D. Fla.): There are in Cuba trained African Communist troops who are to be clandestinely sent into Haiti and the Dominican Republic to provide the muscle for a Communist uprising and takeover. . . .

Danger to Florida Real Estate

MR. RIVERS (D. S.C.): According to my distinguished friend from Florida, who is so eloquent and who recently came from my part of the world, if you do not stop Castro now, soon, real estate in Florida will not be worth 50 cents an acre. . . .

It is as simple as the ABC's if you give the military the word to go ahead, and we can blockade Cuba. You say, "You cannot do it, you may bring on a rain of missiles." If you are afraid to die now, you will be afraid to die two years from now.

Let me say that the greatest philosopher the world has ever had was old Plato. He said, "Only the dead have seen the end of war." If blockading Cuba, brings on war, let our boys die for America. They are not interested in Laos, they are not interested in Indonesia, they are not interested in Berlin. . . .

MR. JOHANSEN (R. Mich.): Mr. Chairman, let us bluntly proclaim to the world that we need the consent of no nation or organization of nations to act for our own self-preservation. . . .

MR. MCMILLAN (D. S.C.): I am of the opinion that the United States should have stopped Castro when he pushed Batista out of office. We, of course, would like to see every country have a democratic form of government; however, Batista, even though he was a dictator, cooperated and worked with our country at all times. . . .

MR. FASCELL (D. Fla.): Some question has been raised about the existence and the death of the Monroe Doctrine. In looking for a date of death, if any, I cannot overlook the time when Mr. Khrushchev took off his shoe in the United Nations and proclaimed that the Monroe Doctrine was dead. Those who have a feeling for the enunciation of this principle had the opportunity to speak loudly and clearly then as they now have to right to speak loudly and clearly; and so let him cast the first stone if he has the guts to do it. . . .

MR. PILLION (R. N.Y.): I submit the following report upon the Soviet military concentrations in Cuba. This report is based upon the most reliable and informed sources.

MR. HAYS (D. Ohio): What are they?

MR. PILLION: I will tell the members of the House in just a minute [he never did—IFS]. The Soviet has under command in Cuba as of now two surface-to-surface nuclear missile launching sites under construction; two ground-to-air nuclear missile sites; 5 naval bases; 15 air bases. Hundreds of Soviet fighter planes, thousands of Soviet-Czech artillery pieces, thousands of Soviet tanks and motorized weapons and troop carriers and 350,000 Soviet trained and equipped troops. . . . Mr. Chairman, let us not repeat the history of Carthage. . . .

MR. JOHNSON (D. Md.): There are those who equate the Soviet action in Cuba with the establishment of American bases in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and other nations throughout the world. I, for one, cannot accept this for several reasons: First, we have built American bases by invitation and for the sole purpose of opposing the threat of communism. . . .

MR. BROOMFIELD (R. Mich.): It is clear that the advantage we once had in our ring of bases on the periphery of Russia —in Turkey, Iran and the NATO nations—and our ability to zero in bombers and missiles on the Soviet Union has been lost by the Communist military buildup in Cuba. . . .

MR. FOUNTAIN (D. S.C.): The absurd idea that we can act only with somebody else's approval, if we do not change, will ultimately mean the end of our way of life. . . .

MR. GROSS (R. Iowa): Cuba is complete proof that foreign aid will buy us nothing. During the 14 years preceding 1961, the U.S. shovelled at least $2,250 million into Cuba through premium prices on Cuban sugar, and through economic and military assistance. During 1960 and 1961, the Sino-Soviet bloc made $100 million available to Cuba. Thus the Communists are now reaping the whirlwind of our folly. . . .

MR. PUCINSKI (D. Ill.): Just so there can be no disagreement as to the extent of the Soviet military buildup, I would urge upon President Kennedy to order a resumption of U-2 flights over Cuba. . . .

MR. ADDABO (D. N.Y.): I thought that Neville Chamberlain proved a long time ago that you could not put an umbrella over a country that a dictator coveted and expect that would keep him out. The Monroe Doctrine says. . . .

Among The Very Few Saner and Calmer Voices Who Spoke Up Amid The Mob Clamor

MR. CELLER (D. N.Y.): Mr. Speaker, the situation in Cuba has certainly affected emotionally a number of elected officials and editors, and has clouded their judgment. Without enlarging upon the proposals they have put forward and examining all possible consequences, they have demanded a naval blockade of Cuba, or outright invasion of Cuba. A naval blockade is, of course, an act of war. . . . A direct invasion at the present time could be easily interpreted as first, an act of aggression which would give the Soviet Union an unprecedented propaganda issue; second, a U.S. acceptance of the principle of preventive war; third, an invitation to the Soviet Union to bomb with rockets our bases on the periphery of Russia and her satellites. I believe most firmly that such loose talk must cease. . . .

MR. BOLAND (D. Mass.): This is no time to listen to political sorcerers, hucksters and adventurers. . . . Only the foolhardy and unthinking would plunge this nation into an unneeded and unwanted war. . . .

MR. COHELAN (D. Cal.): A great nation must have a sense of historical perspective. I am afraid there are some here who sound more like they are in panic. . . . An invasion of the island at this time would utterly destroy the moral influence and authority—and much of the actual power—we now enjoy in the councils of nations. We would be relegated . . . to the footsteps left by the Soviets in smashing into Hungary. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even Literate Liberals Like Douglas and Proxmire Vote for Iron Curtain Practices

Clark Makes Three Attempts to Block Postal Censorship in Senate

The Senate again demonstrated last week that no country in the world has leaders who talk more about freedom than ours, and care less. Senator Clark (D. Pa) tried three times without success to knock censorship out of the postal rate bill. A majority of the Senate voted down each of these attempts, though in one of these three votes, it took a position to the right of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and of its chairman, Walter. Those who voted for postal censorship included such literate men and supposed liberals as Douglas of Illinois and Proxmire of Wisconsin.

The Postoffice began barring foreign "Communist propaganda" from the mails during the Korean war under Truman, and made a silly record doing it (see box below). The National Security Council under Eisenhower recommended that this postal censorship be stopped, and an order to this effect was issued by President Kennedy March 17 of last year. Now it is to be reinstated.

To the Right of the Un-Americans

The source of this aberration is a Republican Congressman from Nebraska, Glenn Cunningham, who is regarded as extremist even by the Un-American Activities Committee and his postal censorship bill as unconstitutional by its chairman, Walter. Nevertheless it passed the House last January with only Congressmen Lindsay and Ryan of New York voting 'nay' and later, this same Mr. Cunningham stampeded the Senate Post Office Committee into reporting out a revised form of postal censorship, with only three members dissenting. One was Clark, the other two Randolph of West Virginia and Yarborough of Texas. With their support Clark moved first to knock postal censorship out of the bill altogether, and then to substitute a non-censorship measure proposed by Walter last year. This, too, was defeated 51 to 23. Clark then tried to make postal censorship discretionary with the President but lost on this also 48 to 33.

One reason for the defeat was the weak attitude taken by the so-called "Irish Mafia" which constitutes the White House liaison with Congress. Their idea is always to compromise. If ever a bill goes in to illegalize motherhood, the "Mafia" will seek to meet the proponents halfway by forbidding motherhood but only in even numbered years. Though the President opposed reinstatement of censorship, and both State Department and USIA testified against it, the White House liaison accepted the Cunningham idea in weaker form. Now it goes to conference where its provisions are likely to be made worse.

A close reading of the debate and of memoranda by the Postal Department to correct wildly erratic statements made by Mr. Cunningham will show that while we are proposing to reinstitute it, censorship on the Soviet side has been easing up. Actually the volume of propagandistic mail going from our side to theirs is now much larger than the volume going from their side to ours. Even under the milder Senate version, writers and scholars and others who want to read what the other side says "will not be able to receive such so called Communist political propaganda," as Clark told the Senate, "unless they write in and ask for it and thereby perhaps get their request placed in an FBI file and subject themselves to slander by any professional flag waver who chooses to contend that those who make such requests are soft on Communism because they choose to inform themselves about what goes on behind the Iron Curtain."

We salute Senator Clark for having the courage to fight this issue in a year when he is himself up for reelection and subject to charges of "soft on . . .", though his position is supported not only by liberal papers like the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* but also by the *Chicago Tribune* (Sept. 18). Too few share his devotion to principle.

The Mails and the First Amendment

"The United States may give up the Post Office when it sees fit, but while it carries on, the use of the mails is almost as much a part of free speech as the right to use our tongues."

—Mr. Justice Holmes, quoted by Clark (D. Pa).

Even A Chess Manual and Czarist Books Banned As "Communist Propaganda"

"Since 1951, our Government has engaged in wholesale confiscation of publications mailed into this country from behind the Iron Curtain. U.S. officials have ruled that these publications, when they contain foreign political propaganda, are nonmailable. . . . Their sieve of restraint has caught not only overt Communist propaganda, but also a pamphlet by a member of the British Parliament criticizing the position of the United States during the Guatemalan revolution of 1954, various pacifist materials from England, scientific works, geographies, novels and, mirabile dictu, **quantities of an edition of the London Economist. . . .**

"The procedures were hasty and improvised, nor were there enough men anywhere to do the job properly—as at St. Paul, where a warehouse full of material accumulated while a non-Russian speaking customs employee, furnished solely with a Russian-English dictionary, attempted to select and detain all publications deemed to contain Communist propaganda. . . .

"The criteria for propaganda were so broad that enforcement officials in the field were able to find suspect matter in Soviet published works on art, religion, philosophy, 19th century literature, and even so political a subject as 'Chess for Beginners.' Volumes of this kind were detained even though they had been published prior to the Czar Nicholas's demise. . . . Indeed books which admittedly were neither pro-Communist nor anti U.S. in theme . . . were occasionally stopped . . . [like] Avro Manhattan's 'Catholic Imperialism and World Power'. . . .

"Ironically, a consignment to one importer who was purchasing Soviet publications for U.S. military agencies was confiscated and lost. Mathematical Review, one of the world's three publications which list all known works in the mathematical field, was deprived of Russian titles for a year. . . . A retired Coast Guard officer in New England had developed a unique avocation: studying various navigation problems confronting the Russian Navy, using all sorts of current Russian magazines. . . . He was told by his local postmaster that he was deemed unqualified to receive the propaganda he wanted."

—From a study by Murray L. Schwartz and James C. N. Paul in the Univ. of Penna. Law Review put in the Cong. Record Sept. 25 by Senator Clark (D. Pa.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The South's Mental Sickness Is A Source of National Danger

(Continued from Page One)

to feel that integration is not just some ruling by a Supreme Court accidentally filled with Negro-lovers but a movement which springs from the deepest ideals of this nation and the most irrepressible aspirations of human beings everywhere. Instead of a synthetic pep-talk, full of oratorical nonsense about Mississippi's great traditions, Lucius Lamar and Jake Lindsey, all lily-white, Mr. Kennedy should have said a word about Meredith, about a Negro air force veteran who fought with honor in Korea and had a right to be treated as a first class citizen on his return home. In all Mississippi's history, not one Mississippian has ever shown as much courage as this young Negro. Could the President not have appealed to young students to wipe away the ugly racial blinders of their elders, to see this as a challenge to their intelligence, their gallantry, at least their sportsmanship?

Not Even One

It is more disturbing than the mob scene that not one single student at Ole Miss has had the desire or the courage to go over and shake Meredith's hand or to sit beside him in class. Those empty seats around him, those continued jeers, condemn Mississippi's younger white generation, even these its most privileged. But how expect them to behave differently when they see their elders egg on the mob or fall silent, when they see even the President and the Attorney General unwilling to go beyond the politically expedient, willing belatedly if necessary to call out the troops, but not to speak up for the justice and the morality of the principles they are enforcing?

Mr. Kennedy's final appeal was to preserve the law and the peace so "we can turn to the greater crises that are without and stand united as one people in our pledge to man's freedom." This stale cold war rhetoric was offensive on so serious an occasion. Devotion to freedom should begin at home. If we can't have it in Mississippi, we won't win it defending dictators in Vietnam. The crises without are nowhere near as real as the crisis within. A large section of the white south is mentally sick on the subject of race; it draws support from paranoid minorities in the North who join it in seeing the Supreme Court as the seat of communistic plotters, and integration as an artificial business stirred up by Jews from New York. Men like Eastland represent this psychopathic undercurrent which makes the mob feel righteous. This sickness could under certain conditions coalesce into a serious rightist threat to free institutions. The time to stop it is now, when it is still weak. This hard fight is Mr. Kennedy's duty; easy flag-waving diversions about dangers abroad are no substitute for it. This sickness in a great nation like ours is a matter of world-wide concern. Only a quarter century ago another great and cultured nation, Germany, destroyed itself and half a continent from the virus of racism. When is the President going to mention it?

New Soviet Proposal on Disarmament

"Taking account of the stand of the Western Powers the Soviet government agrees that in the process of destroying vehicles for the delivery of nuclear weapons at the first stage exception to be made for a strictly limited and agreed number of global intercontinental missiles, anti-missile missiles and anti-aircraft missiles of the ground-to-air type which would remain at the disposal of the USSR and the US alone. Thus for a definite period the means of defense would remain in case someone, as certain Western representatives fear, ventures to violate the treaty and conceal missiles or combat aircraft."

—Mr. Gromyko (USSR) at the UN Sept. 21.

"Mr. Gromyko made a new proposal the other day when he spoke to the Assembly. He suggested that, instead of destroying all nuclear weapons in the first stage, that you might have a limited number and an agreed number of ICBM's which would be retained by the Soviet Union and the United States. . . . At first sight, and I hope I am wrong, it seems to me it is designed to eliminate the West's present superiority in nuclear delivery vehicles. . . . One other question, in connection with what he proposed occurs to me. It is this: If the U.S. and Russia are to retain a certain number of nuclear weapons . . . how are the numbers to be verified?"

—Lord Home (UK) at the UN, Sept. 27.

The original Soviet plan for complete and general disarmament called for destruction of all means of delivering nuclear weapons in the first stage. The Western powers objected and this seems to be an effort to meet this objection halfway.

Don't Forget Our Offer: A Free Copy to A Friend If You Send A Stamped LONG Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/8/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED